

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In view of the remarks and arguments below, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

I. Status of the Claims

No claim amendment is made.

Claims 1-14 are pending. They are presented herein as a courtesy to the Examiner.

II. Withdrawal of Previous Rejection of Claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2

Applicant appreciatively thanks Examiner Chui for the withdrawal of rejection of claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 in view of the Response Applicant filed on January 17, 2008.¹

III. Withdrawal of Previous Rejection of Claims 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicant also appreciatively thanks Examiner Chui for the withdrawal of rejection of claims 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of the Response Applicant filed on January 17, 2008.²

IV. Request for Identification of Certified Copies of Priority Documents not Received

In the outstanding Final Office Action dated April 30, 2008, the box “Some” is checked on the Office Action Summary page under the heading “Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119.” It is accompanied by a footnote (signaled by “**”) five lines below, which states: “See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.”

Applicant appreciatively thanks Examiner Chui for pointing out a possible oversight on Applicant’s part. However, Applicant respectfully submits that no such list is provided in the Detailed Action section that follows, and respectfully requests identification of the priority documents for which certified copies have not been received by the Office.

¹ Final Office Action dated April 30, 2008, page 2, lines 11-12.

² Final Office Action dated April 30, 2008, page 3, lines 1-2.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 over Schrof in view of Becher be withdrawn.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1. Therefore, at least for the same reason as stated above with respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Schrof and Becher, either alone or in combination, do not render claims 2-5 obvious. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 2-5 over Schrof in view of Becher be withdrawn.

VI. Rejection of Claims 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Schrof in view of Becher and further in view of United States Patent No. 5,945,114 to Ogawa et al. ("Ogawa"). The Examiner contends that Schrof in combination with Becher and Ogawa renders claims 6-8 obvious. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 6-8 depend from claim 1. Further, similarly to Schrof and Becher as discussed above in relation to claim 1, Ogawa does not teach or suggest that underwater disintegrability and dispersibility would be significantly improved by utilizing a salt of N-acylamino acid together with an agricultural chemical compound whose melting point or softening point is 70°C or below and an adsorbent carrier. Accordingly, it would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to formulate an agricultural chemical compound whose melting point or softening point is 70°C or below, a salt of N-acylamino acid, and an adsorbent carrier, to obtain an agricultural and horticultural water dispersible granule as recited in claims 6-8 based on the disclosures of Schrof, Becher, and Ogawa.

At least for this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that Schrof, Becher, and Ogawa, either alone or in combination, do not render claims 6-8 obvious. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 6-8 over Schrof in view of Becher and further in view of Ogawa be withdrawn.

